

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-3 and 5-10 are pending in the application with claims 1 and 9 having been amended herein. The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 4 and 5 contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 4 is cancelled herein so its rejection is now moot. In response, to the rejection claim 9 has been amended to state that the high transmission line in question is one in which no fault has occurred. As to the rejection of claims 1 and 5, this rejection is respectfully traversed and it is asserted that, as written, the claim limitations are not confusing, but if confusion remains following the instant explanation, the Examiner is requested to further explain the confusion. The element of claims 1 and 5 referenced by the Examiner recites an input unit that inputs data from transmission lines shared by a plurality of networks and outputs the data to the higher speed transmission lines. This input unit has a higher transmission speed than the other input units. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/13835 to Lauder et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,974 to Majd. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable Lauder, in view of Majd, and in further view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/35411 to Moy et al. And claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lauder in view of Majd and Moy and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,335 to De Vito.

As best understood, Lauder teaches a network hub structure for connecting a WDM network supporting a first bit rate to another network supporting a second bit rate which is a substantial multiple of the first bit rate.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that Lauder fails to teach a memory unit for storing ring construction information, a transmission unit for producing topology information, squelch information and switching information and transmitting these types of information. Further Lauder fails to teach a second switching unit for performing processing including switching operations and bridging operations on the basis of the switching information, as recited in claim 1 as amended.

As best understood Madj teaches a message transmission method using one transmission line when trouble occurs in a second transmission line. Moy teaches a digital wrapper system and DeVito teaches a ring network (SONET).

But Majd, Moy, and DeVito fail to teach the memory unit, transmission unit, and second switching unit as recited in claim 1, and fail to teach the control unit as recited in claim 9.

Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claims 1 and 9 patentably distinguish over the relied upon portions of the cited references and are allowable. Claims 2-3, and 6-8 and 10, which depend from one of these allowable base claims are allowable therewith. For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully requested the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan Weber/
Nathan Weber
Reg. No. 50,958

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-8800

Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987

Docket No.: FUJH 19.250 (100794-00106)